An alternative representation for pure symmetric states of qubits and its applications to entanglement classification

A. Mandilara[1,2], T. Coudreau[1], A. Keller[3] and P. Milman[1]
[1] *Laboratoire Matériaux et Phénomènes Quantiques, Sorbonne Paris Cité, Université Paris Diderot, CNRS UMR 7162, 75013, Paris, France*
[2] *Nazarbayev University, Department of Physics, School of Science and Technology, 53 Kabanbay Batyr Avenue, 010000, Astana, Republic of Kazakhstan and*
[3] *Univ. Paris-Sud 11, Institut de Sciences Moléculaires d'Orsay (CNRS), Bâtiment 350–Campus d'Orsay, 91405 Orsay Cedex, France*

arXiv:1402.0987v3 [quant-ph] 24 Jun 2015

We prove that the vast majority of symmetric states of qubits (or spin 1/2) can be decomposed in a unique way into a superposition of spin 1/2 coherent states. For the case of two qubits, the proposed decomposition reproduces the Schmidt decomposition and therefore, in the case of a higher number of qubits, can be considered as its generalization. We analyze the geometrical aspects of the proposed representation and its invariant properties under the action of local unitary and local invertible transformations. As an application, we identify the most general classes of entanglement and representative states for any number of qubits in a symmetric state.

Symmetric states under permutations have drawn lately a lot of attention in the field of quantum information. The essential reason is that the number of parameters needed for the description of a state in a symmetric subspace scales just linearly with the number of parties. This simplification makes symmetric states a good testground for complex quantum information tasks such as the description of multipartite entanglement [1–8] and quantum tomography [9].

There are two well known representations for symmetric states, the Dicke basis [10] and Majorana representation [11]. In the present work, we introduce a novel representation whose forms resembles strongly to a generalized Schmidt decomposition and that presents advantages with respect to the previous ones as regards the readability of the entanglement properties of the state. The structure of the proposed representation remains invariant under the action of local unitary operations which leave the state in the symmetric subspace. We associate to the proposed decomposition a geometric representation of the states that has the interest of displaying this invariance. We proceed by identifying invariant forms of the representation under the action of local unitary and local invertible transformations. In this way we arrive to an exact classification of entanglement for symmetric states. With the well studied example of three qubits we establish a first connection among the suggested representation and measures of multipartite entanglement. Furthermore, an immediate consequence of our methods is a straightforward estimation of a well established measure of entanglement, the so called Schmidt measure [12] for the symmetric states.

The structure of this paper is the following. We start by recalling some basic properties of the Dicke and Majorana representation and their connection to entanglement classification. We then move to the presentation of the novel decomposition that is the main result of the paper. Finally we employ the properties of the decomposition in order to arrive at a classification of entanglement applicable to the vast majority of symmetric states.

Every symmetric state of N qubits can be expressed in a unique way over the Dicke basis formed by the $N+1$ joined eigenstates $\{|N/2,m\rangle\}$ of the collective operators $\hat{S}_Z=\sum_{i=1}^{N}\hat{\sigma}_i^Z$ and $\hat{S}^2$, where $\vec{\hat{S}}=\sum_{i=1}^{N}\vec{\hat{\sigma}}_i$:

$$|N/2,m\rangle = d_{N,m}^{-1}\sum_{perm}\underbrace{|1\rangle|1\rangle\ldots|1\rangle}_{m+N/2}\underbrace{|0\rangle|0\rangle\ldots|0\rangle}_{N/2-m} \quad (1)$$

where $d_{N,m}=\sqrt{\binom{N}{m+N/2}}$. More specifically $\hat{S}_Z|N/2,m\rangle = m|N/2,m\rangle$ and $\hat{S}^2|N/2,m\rangle = N(N/2+1)/2|N/2,m\rangle$ with $m=-N/2,-N/2+1,...,N/2$. Even if the number of $\hat{S}_Z$ eigenstates is $N+1$, using the freedom of choice of the global phase and the normalization condition, one remains with N complex numbers expressing in a unique way every symmetric state over this basis.

A commonly used alternative to the Dicke basis is the Majorana representation [11] initially proposed to describe states of spin-j systems. This attributes to each state N points on the Bloch sphere in the following way: one projects the given symmetric state $|\Psi\rangle=\sum_{m=-N/2}^{N/2}c_m|N/2,m\rangle$ on a spin coherent state [13] of N qubits defined as

$$|\alpha\rangle = e^{\alpha^*\hat{S}_+}|N/2,-N/2\rangle \quad (2)$$

$$= \sum_{m=-s}^{s}(\alpha^*)^{N/2+m}d_{N,m}|N/2,m\rangle. \quad (3)$$

This projection leads to a polynomial of Nth order on the complex parameter α, the so-called Majorana polynomial:

$$\Psi(\alpha)=\langle\alpha|\Psi\rangle=\sum_{m=-N/2}^{N/2}\lambda_m\alpha^{N/2+m}, \quad (4)$$

with $\lambda_m = d_{N,m}c_m$. The N complex roots $\{\alpha_n\}$ (Majorana roots) of the polynomial $\Psi(\alpha)$

$$\Psi(\alpha) \propto \prod_{n=1}^{N} (\alpha - \alpha_n). \tag{5}$$

fully characterize the state $|\Psi\rangle$. It is possible to introduce a geometric picture by attributing N Bloch vectors $\{\mathbf{v}_n\}$ to the roots $\{\alpha_n\}$ via the inverse stereographic mapping $\{\alpha_n\} \to \left\{e^{i\varphi_n}\tan(\theta_n/2)\right\} \equiv \{\mathbf{v}_n\}$. The edges of these vectors define a set of N points on the Bloch sphere, the so called Majorana stars. Furthermore, using the states $|\chi_n\rangle = \sin(\theta_n/2)|0\rangle - e^{-i\varphi_n}\cos(\theta_n/2)|1\rangle$ which are orthogonal to the states associated to $\{\mathbf{v}_n\}$, one can write in a unique way every symmetric state as

$$|\Psi\rangle = A\sum_{perm} |\chi_1\rangle \otimes |\chi_2\rangle \otimes \ldots |\chi_N\rangle \tag{6}$$

where A is a complex number that stands for the normalization factor and the global phase.

Majorana representation, among other applications [14–17], has proven very useful to the study and classification of entanglement in symmetric states [2–7, 18]. There are two ways to classify entanglement or in other words, to regroup states in classes according to their entanglement properties. In the first classification, each class contains states which can be transformed in each others by Local Unitary (LU) transformations. States belonging to the same, so-called, LU class of entanglement have identical entanglement properties. In the second classification, Stochastic Local Operations and Classical Communication ($SLOCC$) are also allowed. In that case, it can be shown [19, 20] that two states are in the same class if and only if one state can be converted to the other via the use of Invertible Local (IL) operations mathematically implemented by the $SL(2,\mathbb{C})$ group. States belonging to same so-called IL class of entanglement, are entangled in the same way.

Focusing on the case of symmetric states of qubits the LU transformations which leave states in the symmetric subspace are equivalent to collective $\mathbf{SU(2)}$ rotation ($\mathbf{SU(2)} = SU(2)\times SU(2)\ldots\times SU(2)$) [4] where all the $SU(2)$ (single qubit) transformations are identical and are parametrized by 3 real numbers. A symmetric state of qubits is defined by $2N$ real parameters but identifying its invariant part under LU transformations requires only $2N-3$ real numbers, the so-called LU invariants. States with the same LU invariants belong to the same LU entanglement class. There are different ways of identifying a set of LU invariants for a given state [21]. One way is to calculate the values of a complete set of polynomial invariant quantities. Alternatively with the help of LU transformations one can reduce a given state to a properly chosen LU canonical form [22], described by $2N-3$ real numbers. For symmetric states, the Majorana representation offers an overcomplete set of LU invariants with a geometric aspect, the inner products among $\{\mathbf{v}_n\}$. This can be easily understood noting an essential aspect of Majorana representation: Majorana stars rotate uniformly under LU transformations (see Eq.(6)).

In the case of IL transformations for symmetric states, it has been proven [4] that is sufficient to search for interconvertibility via just collective $\mathbf{SL(2,\mathbb{C})}$ operations i.e. $\mathbf{SL(2,\mathbb{C})} = SL(2,\mathbb{C})\times SL(2,\mathbb{C})\ldots\times SL(2,\mathbb{C})$. The $SL(2,\mathbb{C})$ group is the complexification of the $SU(2)$ group and thus a collective IL transformation on a symmetric state is parametrized by 6 real numbers. Similarly to the case of LU transformations, the $2N-6$ invariants of a symmetric state under IL transformations (IL invariants), can be calculated in different ways. It has been recently proven that under SL operations Majorana roots follows Möbius transformations on the complex plane [2, 18, 23] and that a complete set of IL invariants [18] is given by combinations of the roots of the Majorana polynomials. Finally, it is worth mentioning that a third way for classifying entanglement relevant only for symmetric states, has been recently suggested [3]. This last classification is related to the fact that an IL transformation cannot change the classification of degeneracies of the Majorana polynomial Eq.(4).

In what follows we only consider pure states and we call *generic* symmetric state of N qubits, a pure state whose highest degeneracy degree (γ) in Majorana's roots satisfies the condition $\gamma < \frac{N+1}{2}$ or $\gamma = N$ for N odd, and $\gamma < \frac{N}{2}+1$ or $\gamma = N$ when N is even. In the class of generic states, the states with no degeneracies are included which are the states covering the vast majority of space of symmetric states.

We start by claiming that any generic symmetric state $\left|\Psi_{(odd)}\right\rangle$ of N qubits where N is *odd* can be decomposed in a unique way as a superposition of at most $(N-1)/2$ spin coherent states $|\mathbf{\Phi}_m\rangle$:

$$\left|\Psi_{(odd)}\right\rangle = \left(\sum_{m=0}^{(N-1)/2} c_m |\mathbf{\Phi}_m\rangle\right) \tag{7}$$
$$|\mathbf{\Phi}_m\rangle = |\phi_m\rangle \otimes |\phi_m\rangle \ldots |\phi_m\rangle.$$

As a convention we arrange the complex amplitudes c_m in decreasing sequence $|c_0| > |c_1| > \ldots > \left|c_{(N-1)/2}\right|$ and for the single qubit states $|\phi_m\rangle$, we use the specific parametrization $|\phi_m\rangle = \cos(\theta_m/2)|0\rangle + e^{i\varphi_m}\sin(\theta_m/2)|1\rangle$. We also note that in the general case $\langle\phi_n|\phi_m\rangle \neq 0$. If we exploit the normalization condition and the freedom of choice of the global phase, we can rewrite the state in the following more convenient form for our purposes,

$$\left|\Psi_{(odd)}\right\rangle = A\left(|\mathbf{\Phi}_0\rangle + \sum_{m=1}^{(N-1)/2} y_m e^{ik_m}|\mathbf{\Phi}_m\rangle\right) \tag{8}$$

where $y_m = |c_m/c_0| < 1$, $e^{ik_m} = c_m(c_0 y_m)^{-1}$ and A the normalization factor. The proof of Eq.(7) which is presented in the Appendix, additionally provides the steps

for identifying the parameters of decomposition (states $|\phi_m\rangle$ and coefficients c_m) for a given generic state.

For the case of an *even* number of qubits, the decomposition is slightly different. We prove in the Appendix that the following unique decomposition exists

$$\left|\Psi_{(even)}\right\rangle = c_0 \left|\mathbf{\Phi}_0\right\rangle + c_1 \left|\mathbf{\Phi}_0^{\perp}\right\rangle + \sum_{\substack{m=2 \\ (N>2)}}^{N/2} c_m \left|\mathbf{\Phi}_m\right\rangle \qquad (9)$$
$$\left|\mathbf{\Phi}_m\right\rangle = \left|\phi_m\right\rangle \otimes \left|\phi_m\right\rangle ... \left|\phi_m\right\rangle .$$

The complex amplitudes c_m satisfy now the following conditions: $|c_2| > ... > \left|c_{N/2}\right|$ and $|c_0| > |c_1|$. In addition $\langle\phi_0 \left|\phi_0^{\perp}\right\rangle = 0$. For the single qubit states we use as before the convention $\left|\phi_m\right\rangle = \cos(\theta_m/2)\left|0\right\rangle + e^{i\varphi_m}\sin(\theta_m/2)\left|1\right\rangle$. We suggest the more convenient form

$$\left|\Psi_{(even)}\right\rangle = A\left(\left|\mathbf{\Phi}_0\right\rangle + y_1 e^{ik_1}\left|\mathbf{\Phi}_0^{\perp}\right\rangle + \sum_{\substack{m=2 \\ (N>2)}}^{N/2} y_m e^{ik_m}\left|\mathbf{\Phi}_m\right\rangle\right) \qquad (10)$$

where $y_m = |c_m/c_0|$, $e^{ik_m} = c_m(c_0 y_m)^{-1}$ and A the normalization factor.

One interesting feature of the decomposition Eq.(8) is that it permits us to obtain a geometrical image for the state $\left|\Psi_{(odd)}\right\rangle$. We can represent Eq.(8) on the Bloch ball with one normalized vector $\left|\phi_0\right\rangle$ and $(N-1)/2$ unnormalized vectors $y_m\left|\phi_m\right\rangle$ of length $\mathbf{l} \leqslant 1$. The only ingredient missing in the picture are the $(N-1)/2$ real phases k_m. Similarly, in the case of an even number of quits, one can attribute a geometrical picture to the state in Eq.(10), with normalized vector $\left|\phi_0\right\rangle$, the unnormalized vector $y_1\left|\phi_0^{\perp}\right\rangle$, and $N/2-1$ unnormalized vectors $y_m\left|\phi_m\right\rangle$. This geometric picture remains invariant under the action of local unitary transformations which leave the state permutationaly symmetric.

In order to show this, let us start with the case of an odd number of qubits and consider the state $\left|\Psi_{(odd)}\right\rangle$ in Eq.(8). We denote $\left|\Psi'_{(odd)}\right\rangle = \hat{U}\left|\Psi_{(odd)}\right\rangle$ with $\hat{U} \in \mathbf{SU(2)}$ and introduce the new phases k'_m defined as $e^{ik'_m}\left|\mathbf{\Phi}'_m\right\rangle = \hat{U}e^{ik_m}\left|\mathbf{\Phi}_m\right\rangle$ such that the single qubit parametrization remains as $\left|\phi'_m\right\rangle = \cos(\theta'_m/2)\left|0\right\rangle + e^{i\varphi'_m}\sin(\theta'_m/2)\left|1\right\rangle$. The new representation for the rotated state $\left|\Psi'\right\rangle$ is

$$\left|\Psi'_{(odd)}\right\rangle = A\left(\left|\mathbf{\Phi}'_0\right\rangle + \sum_{m=1}^{(N-1)/2} y_m e^{ik'_m - ik'_0}\left|\mathbf{\Phi}'_m\right\rangle\right). \qquad (11)$$

In analogy, for an even number of qubits and starting from the state represented in Eq.(10) we arrive to

$$\left|\Psi'_{(even)}\right\rangle = A(\left|\mathbf{\Phi}'_0\right\rangle + y_1 e^{ik'_1 - ik'_0}\left|\mathbf{\Phi}'^{\perp}_0\right\rangle + \sum_{\substack{m=2 \\ (N>2)}}^{N/2} y_m e^{ik'_m - ik'_0}\left|\mathbf{\Phi}'_m\right\rangle) \qquad (12)$$

Geometrically speaking, the vectors $\{y_m\left|\phi_m\right\rangle\}$ of the initial state (Eq.(10) or Eq.(8)) represented on the Bloch ball simply undergo an uniform rotation under the action of LU operators. In other words the suggested geometric representation of the decomposition rotates as a rigid body. These observations lead naturally to the first criteria offered by our representation:

Criterion 1 *If two symmetric states are convertible among each other via LU rotations, their representation on the Bloch ball are identical up to global rotations of the ball.*

Criterion 2 *An overcomplete set of LU invariants is formed by the complex numbers $e^{ik_m - ik_n}\langle\mathbf{\Phi}_n\left|\mathbf{\Phi}_m\right\rangle$, the real positive numbers $\{y_m\}$ and the normalization factor A.*

A second option for identifying LU invariants of state Eq.(8) is to apply $\mathbf{SU(2)}$ operations in order to reduce it into a canonical state characterized by $2N-3$ real parameters [22]. We define the following $LU-$canonical state for an odd number of qubits

$$\left|\Psi^{LU}_{(odd)}\right\rangle = A\left(\left|\mathbf{1}\right\rangle + y_1\left|\mathbf{X}_1\right\rangle + \sum_{m=2}^{(N-1)/2} y_m e^{il_m}\left|\mathbf{X}_m\right\rangle\right), \qquad (13)$$

and an analogous form for an even number of qubits

$$\left|\Psi^{LU}_{(even)}\right\rangle = A\left(\left|\mathbf{1}\right\rangle + y_1\left|\mathbf{0}\right\rangle + \sum_{m=2}^{N/2} y_m e^{il_m}\left|\mathbf{X}_m\right\rangle\right). \qquad (14)$$

Every state in Eq.(8) (Eq.(10)) can be reduced to Eq.(13) (Eq.(14)) by LU transformations. The $2N-3$ real parameters of Eq.(13) (Eq.(14)) consists in a complete set of independent LU invariants.

Criterion 3 *Two states are equivalent under LU iff they have identical LU−canonical forms.*

By definition, states equivalent under LU belong to the same LU class of entanglement and therefore Eqs.(13)-(14) permits us to identify all the LU classes of generic symmetric states.

Concerning IL operations the situation naturally becomes more complex. Let us first consider the odd case, and apply a collective operation $\hat{V} \in \mathbf{SL(2,\mathbb{C})}$ to the initial state $\left|\Psi_{(odd)}\right\rangle$ in Eq.(8). Denoting the resulting state by $\left|\Psi''_{(odd)}\right\rangle = \hat{V}\left|\Psi_{(odd)}\right\rangle$ then

$$\left|\Psi''_{(odd)}\right\rangle = A''\left(y''_0 e^{ik''_0}\left|\mathbf{\Phi}''_0\right\rangle + \sum_{m=1}^{(N-1)/2} y''_m e^{ik''_m}\left|\mathbf{\Phi}''_m\right\rangle\right). \qquad (15)$$

One may observe that the action of IL operations preserves the form of the representation, up to a rearrangement of terms which has to be performed, so that the condition $y_0 > y_1 > \ldots > y_{(N-1)/2}$ is satisfied. One can

also see that contrary to the LU case, the suggested representation does not provide *obvious* IL invariant quantities. We circumvent this problem by defining the following IL-canonical form [22, 24] for a generic state of an odd number of qubits

$$\left|\Psi^{IL}_{(odd)}\right\rangle = A\left(|\mathbf{0}\rangle + |\mathbf{1}\rangle + \sum_{m=2}^{(N-1)/2} \lambda_m e^{i\xi_m} |\mathbf{\Xi}_m\rangle\right), \quad (16)$$

where we applied $\mathbf{SL}(\mathbf{2},\mathbb{C})$ operations to reduce the number of parameters in Eq.(8) and set : $|\mathbf{\Phi}_0\rangle \rightarrow |\mathbf{0}\rangle$, $|\mathbf{\Phi}_1\rangle \rightarrow |\mathbf{1}\rangle$ and $y_1 e^{ik_1} \rightarrow 1$. We note here that in the general case the coefficients λ_m in Eq.(16) are not ordered and the condition $|\lambda_m| < 1$ is not necessarily satisfied.

For the case of an even number of qubits IL operations do not conserve the form since they do not preserve the orthogonality condition $\langle\phi_0 \left|\phi_0^{\perp}\right\rangle = 0$. Despite this fact, we can define an $IL-$canonical form for even number of qubits

$$\left|\Psi^{IL}_{(even)}\right\rangle = \left|\Psi^{IL}_{(even)}\right\rangle = A(|\mathbf{0}\rangle + |\mathbf{1}\rangle + \lambda |\mathbf{c}\rangle + \sum_{m=3}^{N/2} \lambda_m e^{i\xi_m} |\mathbf{\Xi}_m\rangle) \quad (17)$$

where $|c\rangle = (c|0\rangle + |1\rangle)/\sqrt{1+|c|^2}$. The complex numbers c and λ are not independent and they are related to each other via a parametric relation which is provided in the Appendix together with the proof of Eq.(C1).

The $2N-6$ real numbers in Eq.(16) (Eq.(C1)) form a complete set of IL invariant and therefore we can state the following criterion:

Criterion 4 *Two states are equivalent under IL operations iff they have identical $IL-$canonical forms.*

By definition, states equivalent under IL operations belong to the same IL class (or just class) of entanglement and these are entangled the same way [19], [20]. In consequence the canonical forms in Eqs.(15)-(C1) permit us to identify all IL classes for generic symmetric states of qubits as well as representative states of these.

Finally, it is important to note that the decomposition given by Eq.(7) and Eq.(9) provides straightforwardly the Schmidt measure [12] for every generic symmetric state. Indeed, if we note r the number of non zero y_m coefficients, then the Schmidt measure is given by $P = \log_2(r)$. So, as a byproduct our method provide for free a method to calculate the Schmidt measure and a classification of entanglement of generic symmetric states according to this widely used measure of entanglement. We illustrate here the different aspects of the proposed decomposition by discussing in detail the 3 qubit case.

According to Eq.(8) a generic state of 3 qubits can be written as

$$|\Psi\rangle = A\left(|\mathbf{\Phi}_0\rangle + ye^{ik}|\mathbf{\Phi}_1\rangle\right) \quad (18)$$



FIG. 1: The geometric representation (a) for a general symmetric state of 3 qubits Eq.(18). The normalized vector $|\phi_0\rangle$ is represented by the (red) dotted vector while the unnormalized vector $y|\phi_1\rangle$ by a (blue) solid vector. (b) The $LU-$canonic form of a state as in Eq.(20). (c) The geometric representation of a GHZ state for any number of qubits.

where A the normalization factor. The obtained form Eq.(18) corresponds to previously derived 3 qubit extension of Schmidt decomposition [19, 25].

Using our results, the 3 qubit symmetric state is represented by the two vectors $|\phi_0\rangle$ and $y|\phi_1\rangle$ in the Bloch ball as in Fig.1(a). For the state of maximum tripartite entanglement, i.e. the GHZ state $(|\mathbf{0}\rangle + |\mathbf{1}\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, we have $\langle\phi_0|\phi_1\rangle = 0$ and $y = 1$. Therefore, a GHZ state is geometrically represented by two normalized and orthogonal vectors (see Fig.1(c)). It is easy to check that this geometric representation (by two orthogonal vectors) holds

true for all GHZ states independently of the number (N) of qubits.

Now let us investigate how the 3-tangle τ [26], a widely applied measure of entanglement, is related to the LU invariant characteristics of the representation : y, $e^{-ik}\left\langle \mathbf{\Phi}_1 \right| \left. \mathbf{\Phi}_0 \right\rangle$ and A. For state $|\Psi\rangle$ in Eq.(18) we have

$$\tau = 4y^2 \left(1 - \left|\left\langle \mathbf{\Phi}_0 \right| \left. \mathbf{\Phi}_1 \right\rangle\right|^{2/3}\right)^{3/2} A^4. \tag{19}$$

Furthermore, we may compare 3-tangle with the invariant set of parameters deduced by the $LU-$canonical form of the given state $|\Psi\rangle$,i.e.,

$$\left|\Psi^{LU}\right\rangle = A\left(|\mathbf{1}\rangle + y\,|\mathbf{X}\rangle\right) \tag{20}$$

where $|\mathbf{X}\rangle = |\chi\rangle\,|\chi\rangle\,|\chi\rangle$ with $|\chi\rangle = \left(\cos(\varepsilon/2)\,|0\rangle + e^{i\varphi}\sin(\varepsilon/2)\,|1\rangle\right)$ and

$$A^{-2} = 1 + y^2 + 2y\cos(3\phi)\sin^3\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right).$$

According to Eq.(13) the complete set of LU invariants is formed by the 3 real numbers $\{y, \varepsilon, \varphi\}$ with $0 < y \leqslant 1$, $0 < \varepsilon \leq \pi$ and $0 < \varphi \leq 2\pi$. In addition, for this case ($N = 3$) the geometric representation for $|\Psi_{LU}\rangle$ in Eq.(20) is faithful and one may visualize the set of invariants on the Bloch Ball by the length and position of the vector $y\,|\chi\rangle$ (see Fig.1 (b)). The 3$-$tangle depends on $\{y, \varepsilon, \phi\}$ via the simple and intuitive relation

$$\tau = \frac{4y^2\cos^3(\varepsilon/2)}{\left(1 + y^2 + 2y\cos(3\phi)\sin^3\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)\right)^2}. \tag{21}$$

The 3-tangle thus is monotonically increasing with y and decreasing with ε, while ϕ produces small oscillations. The geometric representation, Fig.1 (b), thus permits us to compare in a qualitative manner the amount of tripartite entanglement among different states.

We have derived a novel representation for generic symmetric states of qubits and we have applied it to provide a complete solution to the problem of entanglement classification of such states. We believe that the suggested decomposition is a general tool with potential applications in other fields of quantum physics, including quantum optics with collective spin states.

We thank R. Mosseri and D. Markham for useful discussions. The authors acknowledge financial support by ANR under project HIDE. AM is grateful to Alexander Meill for his critical feedback on the previous version of this work.

Appendix A: The decomposition for an odd number of qubits

Here we prove the existence and the uniqueness of the decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\Psi_{(odd)}\right\rangle &= \left(\sum_{m=0}^{(N-1)/2} c_m \left|\mathbf{\Phi}_m\right\rangle\right) \\ \left|\mathbf{\Phi}_m\right\rangle &= |\phi_m\rangle \otimes |\phi_m\rangle \ldots |\phi_m\rangle\,, \end{aligned} \tag{A1}$$

for generic states of an odd number of qubits. The complex amplitudes c_m in Eq.(A1) are of decreasing sequence $|c_0| > |c_1| > \ldots > \left|c_{(N-1)/2}\right|$ and

$$|\phi_m\rangle = \cos(\theta_m/2)\,|0\rangle + e^{i\varphi_m}\sin(\theta_m/2)\,|1\rangle$$

single qubit states whicha are either all distinct with each other or all identical.

Proof.

To prove the wanted result, we initially assume the existence of the decomposition for a given state. Then we derive the conditions under which, the unknown parameters of the decomposition can be uniquely determined by the Majorana roots of this state.

For a given state $|\Psi\rangle$ expressed in the computational basis, one can always derive the corresponding Majorana polynomial [11], $\Psi(\alpha) = \sum_{m=0}^{N} \lambda_m \alpha^m$ and the N roots $\{\alpha_n\}$ corresponding to the solution of the equation $\Psi(\alpha) = 0$. In addition, we denote by α_0 the value of the Majorana polynomial on zero as $\alpha_0 = \lambda_0$.

We assume initially that for the given state $|\Psi\rangle$, the decomposition, Eq.(A1), is possible. For convenience reasons we rewrite the decomposition Eq.(A1) as

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi\rangle &= \left(\sum_{m=0}^{(N-1)/2} c'_m \left|\mathbf{\Phi}'_m\right\rangle\right) \\ \left|\mathbf{\Phi}'_m\right\rangle &= |\phi'_m\rangle \otimes |\phi'_m\rangle \ldots |\phi'_m\rangle \end{aligned} \tag{A2}$$

where $|\phi'_m\rangle$ are now unormalized vectors :

$$|\phi'_m\rangle = (|0\rangle + \beta_m\,|1\rangle)$$

with $\beta_m = e^{i\varphi_m}\tan(\theta_m/2)$. The new complex amplitudes c'_m are related with those in Eq.(A1) via the relation $c'_m = c_m / \left(1 + |\beta_m|^2\right)^{N/2}$.

At next step, we project the state $|\Psi\rangle$ decomposed as in Eq.(A2) on the spin coherent state $|\alpha\rangle = |\alpha\rangle \otimes |\alpha\rangle \otimes \ldots |\alpha\rangle$ where $|\alpha\rangle = |0\rangle + \alpha^*\,|1\rangle$. We thus obtain the following polynomial

$$P(\alpha) = \sum_{m=0}^{(N-1)/2} c'_m \left(1 + \alpha\beta_m\right)^N \tag{A3}$$

.

Our aim is to determine the $N+1$ unknown coefficients $\{c'_m\}$ and $\{\beta_m\}$ by the $N+1$ known complex numbers

$\{\alpha_n\}$. By construction, $\Psi(\alpha) = P(\alpha)$ since both represent $\langle\alpha|\Psi\rangle$. As a direct consequence, the two polynomials share the same roots α_i, such that $P(\alpha_i) = 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, N$. This way we obtain the following set of conditions:

$$\sum_{m=0}^{(N-1)/2} c'_m (1 + \alpha_i \beta_m)^N = 0 \tag{A4}$$

where $i = 1, \ldots, N$. In addition, $\Psi(0) = P(0) = \alpha_0$ that leads to

$$\sum_{m=0}^{(N-1)/2} c'_m = \alpha_0. \tag{A5}$$

One may observe that the N conditions Eq.(A4) form a linear and homogeneous system of equations on the $(N+1)/2$ parameters $\{c'_m\}$. This system is overdefined and in order to have a non-zero solution for $\{c'_m\}$ the equations should be linearly dependent.

One way to impose the linear dependence is to require that each vector defined by the $\frac{N+1}{2}$ coefficients $\left[(1 + \alpha_i \beta_m)^N ; m = 0, 1, \cdots \frac{N-1}{2}\right]$ of the ith equation, with $i \geq (N+1)/2$, remains in the subspace defined by the first $(N-1)/2$ vectors. This provides us with the following $(N+1)/2$ conditions:

$$Det \begin{bmatrix} (1+\alpha_1\beta_0)^N & (1+\alpha_1\beta_1)^N & \ldots & \left(1+\alpha_1\beta_{(N-1)/2}\right)^N \\ (1+\alpha_2\beta_0)^N & (1+\alpha_2\beta_1)^N & & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \left(1+\alpha_{(N-1)/2}\beta_0\right)^N & \left(1+\alpha_{(N-1)/2}\beta_1\right)^N & \ldots & \left(1+\alpha_{(N-1)/2}\beta_{(N-1)/2}\right)^N \\ (1+\alpha_i\beta_0)^N & (1+\alpha_i\beta_1)^N & \ldots & \left(1+\alpha_i\beta_{(N-1)/2}\right)^N \end{bmatrix} = 0 \tag{A6}$$

for $i = (N+1)/2, \ldots, N$ which allow the determination of the $(N+1)/2$ parameters $\{\beta_m\}$. At next step, one may solve the linear system of equations composed by Eq.(A5) and any $(N-1)/2$ equation of the system Eq.(A4), in order to identify the parameters $\{c'_m\}$.

One can easily conclude at this point, that the degeneracies in β's parameters must be related to those of the roots α_i. Let us postpone the analysis of degeneracies at the end of the proof and show below the uniqueness of the solution assuming that all α_i, (and in consequence all β's) are distinct.

Uniqueness of the solution. What is not obvious from the analysis above is the uniqueness of the solution (up to permutations and all β_m distinct) and let us clarify this point. One can check that each ith determinant Eq.(A6) is of the order $(1+N)(1+3N)/8$ on β's. However the i determinant factorizes to a product of $\prod_{i=0, j=1, j>i}^{\frac{N-1}{2}} (\beta_i - \beta_j)$ and a polynomial $f_i = F\left(\{\beta_m\}, \{\alpha_{n(\neq i)}\}, \alpha_i\right)$ of order $M = (1+N)(1+3N)/8 - \frac{(\frac{N+1}{2})!}{(\frac{N-3}{2})!2}$. Since a solution where two or more of β's coincide is not admissible, one has to analyze the roots of the polynomials f_i. Each of the polynomials f_i is invariant under permutations of $\{\beta_m\}$ and it can be rewritten on the basis of $\frac{N+1}{2}$ elementary symmetric polynomials on these variables. In other words, one can proceed with a change of variables from $\{\beta_m\}$ to symmetric combinations of them. For instance, in the case of 3 qubits, one rewrites the polynomials in terms of the two variables $x_0 = \beta_0 + \beta_1$ and $x_1 = \beta_0\beta_1$. Such transformation is further reducing the order of the polynomials f_i to $K = \frac{N+1}{2}$. According to Bézout's theorem, the maximum number of (complex) roots for K polynomials on K variables, of K order each (as we have in our case) is K^K. However, if one proceeds with the solution of the system of equations one finds only one non trivial solution and the trivial solutions of high degeneracy degree correspond to degeneracies in β's. In the simplest case of 3 qubits the degenerate solution is of third order and implies that $\beta_0 = \beta_1$. This fact can be explicitly checked since the polynomials f_1 and f_2 are elliptic equations. In the general case ($N > 3$), the high degree of degeneracy in the solution is justified by the fact that the polynomials f_i are identical up to an interchange of a single parameter, i.e. the α_i root.

Degeneracies in Majorana roots In the case where one (or more) Majorana root, i.e. α_k is degenerate of lth order one has to supplement the system of equations (A4) and (A5) with the following ones

$$\left.\frac{d^j P(\alpha)}{d\alpha^j}\right|_{\alpha=\alpha_k} = \sum_{m=0}^{(N-1)/2} c'_m \beta_m^j (1 + \alpha_k \beta_m)^{N-j} = 0 \tag{A7}$$

where $j = 1, \ldots, l-1$. The solution remains unique in this case and there are no degeneracies in β's.

The procedure above does not work when the highest degeneracy degree (γ) of the roots $\{\alpha_n\}$ of $\Psi(\alpha)$ takes an integer value in the interval $\left[\frac{N+1}{2}, N-1\right]$. In this case the decomposition Eq.(A1) is not unique and therefore

out of our interest. Let us prove this statement first for the case where $\gamma = \frac{N+1}{2}$ for the root α_k.

The determinant of the system of Eqs.(A7) where $j = 1, \ldots, (N-1)/2$ supplemented by

$$\sum_{m=0}^{(N-1)/2} c'_m \left(1 + \alpha_k \beta_m\right)^N = 0 \tag{A8}$$

is

$$\prod_{m=0}^{\frac{N-1}{2}} \left(1 + \alpha_k \beta_m\right)^{\frac{N+1}{2}} \prod_{\substack{i=0,j=1 \\ (j>i)}}^{\frac{N-1}{2}} \left(\beta_i - \beta_j\right) = 0. \tag{A9}$$

This determinant should vanish (to have a non trivial solution for the global system), and therefore either at least one of the terms $(1 + \alpha_k \beta_m)$ is zero or at least two of β_m coincide. In both cases, the initial system of $\frac{N+1}{2}$ equations Eqs.(A7)-(A8) contains now $\frac{N-1}{2}$ unknowns. If one pick $\frac{N-1}{2}$ of the equations and requires that the determinant vanishes, one arrives to an expression similar to Eq.(A9) that implies that at least one of the terms $(1 + \alpha_k \beta_m)$ (for $m \neq 1$) is zero or at least two of the rest of the β_m coincide. Repeating the procedure, $(N-3)/2$ times one arrives to the conclusion that all β_m has to coincide.

Analogous procedure maybe be used to prove that for $N > \gamma > \frac{N+1}{2}$ the decomposition of the form Eq.(A3) does not hold. A straightforward consequence is that the Dicke states (apart from highest and lowest one) cannot be represented via our proposed decomposition.

It is obvious from the above analysis that the decomposition does not allow degeneracies in $\beta' s$ apart from the extreme case (of separable states) where all $\beta' s$ coincide. One may prove this result in an alternative way by searching the conditions under which the decomposition Eq.(A1) is allowed to have less components. One then arrives to the conclusion, that the existence of a relevant amount of degeneracies in the roots α's is required. However, this analysis leads to a solution that is not unique. Furthermore, we would like to underline that for some cases, e.g. the GHZ state, less components are present in the decomposition. Such reduced forms are due to vanishing c's and not due to the degeneracies in $\beta' s$.

■

Appendix B: The decomposition for an even number of qubits

A generic state of qubits can be put in the following form

$$\left|\Psi_{(even)}\right\rangle = c_0 \left|\mathbf{\Phi}_0\right\rangle + c_1 \left|\mathbf{\Phi}_0^{\perp}\right\rangle + \sum_{\substack{m=2 \\ (N>2)}}^{N/2} c_m \left|\mathbf{\Phi}_m\right\rangle \tag{B1}$$

$$\left|\mathbf{\Phi}_m\right\rangle = \left|\phi_m\right\rangle \otimes \left|\phi_m\right\rangle \ldots \left|\phi_m\right\rangle$$

The complex amplitudes c_m satisfy now the following conditions: $|c_2| > \ldots > \left|c_{N/2}\right|$ and $|c_0| > |c_1|$. In addition $\langle \phi_0 \left|\phi_0^{\perp}\right\rangle = 0$.

Proof.

Let us assume that $\left|\phi_0^{\perp}\right\rangle = |\phi_1\rangle$ where $|\phi_1\rangle$ a state independent to $|\phi_0\rangle$. Then the proof of the existence of the decomposition Eq.(B1) follows the same lines as for an odd number of qubits. One takes exactly the same steps in order to identify the $N+1$ complex numbers $\beta_{m,m\neq 1}$ in the polynomial

$$P\left(\alpha\right) = \sum_{m=0}^{N/2} c'_m \left(1 + \alpha \beta_m\right)^N \tag{B2}$$

in terms of the N roots of the Majorana polynomial, α_0 and the free parameter β_1. At this point one should impose an extra condition and the choice should be such that the final solution is unique up to permutations. The form of dependence of the parameters $\beta_{m,m\neq 1}$ on the parameter β_1 lead us to following condition

$$\prod_{i=0}^{N/2} \left(1 + \beta_i^* \beta_1\right) = 0, \tag{B3}$$

a condition which notably remains invariant under the action of local unitary transformations. The solution that follows from the Eq.(B3) is not unique since $|\phi_1\rangle$ can be orthogonal to any of the rest of states. In other words there are N different solutions and we have to impose an extra condition making the solution unique. *We choose the solution that maximizes the amplitude* $|c_0|$ *for* $|\mathbf{\Phi}_0\rangle$.

Concerning the impossibility of decomposition Eq.(B1) the same analysis can be made as for the odd number of qubits. One arrives to the conclusion that when $N > \gamma \geqslant \frac{N}{2} + 1$ one cannot express the state as in Eq.(B1).

■

Appendix C: The $IL-$canonical form for an even number of qubits

A generic state of an even number of qubits can be reduced to the following $IL-$canonical form under the action of invertible local (IL) transformations

$$\left|\Psi_{(even)}^{IL}\right\rangle = A(|\mathbf{0}\rangle + |\mathbf{1}\rangle + \lambda \left|\mathbf{c}\right\rangle + \sum_{m=3}^{N/2} \lambda_m e^{i\xi_m} \left|\mathbf{\Xi}_m\right\rangle) \tag{C1}$$

where $|c\rangle = \left(|0\rangle + c\,|1\rangle\right) / \sqrt{1 + |c|^2}$. The complex numbers c and λ are not independent and they are related to each other via a parametric relation.

Proof.

We start by decomposing the given state as in Eq.(B1). If we divide the expression Eq.(B1) by c_0 and renormalize

it we arrive to the following equivalent decomposition

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\Psi_{(even)}\right\rangle &= A(|\mathbf{\Phi}_0\rangle + c_1' \left|\mathbf{\Phi}_0^{\perp}\right\rangle + c_2' |\mathbf{\Phi}_2\rangle \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{m=3 \\ (N>4)}}^{N/2} c_m' |\mathbf{\Phi}_m\rangle) \qquad \text{(C2)} \\ |\mathbf{\Phi}_m\rangle &= |\phi_m\rangle \otimes |\phi_m\rangle ... |\phi_m\rangle \\ |\phi_m\rangle &= \cos(\theta_m/2)|0\rangle + e^{i\varphi_m}\sin(\theta_m/2)|1\rangle \\ \left|\phi_0^{\perp}\right\rangle &= -\sin(\theta_0/2)|0\rangle + e^{i\varphi_0}\cos(\theta_0/2)|1\rangle\end{aligned}$$

where A the normalization factor.

An IL transformation is implemented by the action of element of the $SL(2,C)$ group. A matrix representation of such transformation is

$$G = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ d & f \end{pmatrix} \qquad \text{(C3)}$$

where a, b, d, f complex numbers satisfying the condition $af - bd = 1$.

We apply transformation $\mathbf{G} = G \times G \times \ldots G$ on the state Eq.(C2) and impose that

$$(c_1')^{1/N} G \left|\phi_0^{\perp}\right\rangle = (s)^{1/N}|0\rangle \qquad \text{(C4)}$$

$$(c_2')^{1/N} G |\phi_2\rangle = (s)^{1/N}|1\rangle \qquad \text{(C5)}$$

where s an arbritary complex number. The conditions Eqs.(C4)-(C5) together with the condition $af - bd = 1$ allow us to determine the elements of the matrix G and the parameter s via the known numbers θ_0, φ_0, θ_1, φ_1, c_1' and c_2'.

Under the action of $\mathbf{G}$ the initial state Eq.(C2) is transformed to

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{G}\left|\Psi_{(even)}\right\rangle &= A'(\frac{1}{s}\mathbf{G}|\mathbf{\Phi}_0\rangle + |\mathbf{0}\rangle + |\mathbf{1}\rangle \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{m=3 \\ (N>4)}}^{N/2} c_m'' \left|\mathbf{\Phi}_m''\right\rangle). \qquad \text{(C6)}\end{aligned}$$

If we rewrite $\left(\frac{1}{s}\right)^{1/N} G|\phi_0\rangle = \lambda^{1/N}\frac{(|0\rangle + c|1\rangle)}{\sqrt{1+|c|^2}}$ then it is easy to verify that the complex numbers λ and c are dependent via the following parametric relation

$$\begin{aligned}c &= e^{i\phi_0}\frac{c_1'}{c_2'}\left(e^{i\phi_0}\sin(\theta_0/2)\cos(\theta_1/2) - e^{i\phi_1}\cos(\theta_0/2)\sin(\theta_1/2)\right)^{-1} \\ \lambda &= \frac{\sqrt{1+|c|^2}}{c_1'}\frac{\left(e^{i\phi_0}\sin(\theta_0/2)\cos(\theta_1/2) - e^{i\phi_1}\cos(\theta_0/2)\sin(\theta_1/2)\right)}{\left(e^{i\phi_0}\cos(\theta_0/2)\cos(\theta_1/2) + e^{i\phi_1}\sin(\theta_0/2)\sin(\theta_1/2)\right)}.\end{aligned}$$

■

[1] J. K. Stockton, J. M. Geremia, A. C. Doherty, H. Mabuchi, Phys. Rev. A 67, 022112 (2003); L. Novo, T. Moroder, and O. Gühne, Phys. Rev. A 88, 012305 (2013); R. Augusiak, J. Tura, J. Samsonowicz, M. Lewenstein, Phys. Rev. A 86, 042316 (2012).

[2] M. Aulbach, Int. J. Quantum Inform. 10, 1230004 (2012).

[3] T. Bastin, S. Krins, P. Mathonet, M. Godefroid, L. Lamata, and E. Solano, Phys. Rev. Lett. 103, 070503 (2009).

[4] P. Mathonet, S. Krins, M. Godefroid, L. Lamata, E. Solano, and T. Bastin, Phys. Rev. A 81, 052315 (2010).

[5] J. Martin, O. Giraud, P. A. Braun, D. Braun, and T. Bastin, Phys. Rev. A 81, 062347 (2010).

[6] M. Aulbach, D. Markham and M. Murao, New J. of Phys. 12, 073025 (2010).

[7] D. J. H. Markham, Phys. Rev. A 83, 042332 (2011).

[8] D. W. Lyons and S. N. Walck, Phys. Rev. A, 84, 042340 (2011).

[9] G. Tóth, W. Wieczorek, D. Gross, R. Krischek, C.Schwemmer, and H. Weinfurter, Phys. Rev. Lett. 105, 250403 (2010); A. B.Klimov, G. Björk, and L. L. Sánchez-Soto, Phys. Rev. A 87, 012109 (2013); T. Moroder, P. Hyllus, G. Tóth, C. Schwemmer, A. Niggebaum, S. Gaile, O. Guhne, and H. Weinfurter, New J. Phys., 14,105001 (2012).

[10] R. Dicke, Phys. Rev. 93, 99 (1954).

[11] E. Majorana, Nuovo Cimento 9, 43-50 (1932).

[12] J. Eisert and H. J. Briegel, Phys. Rev. A 64 (2), 022306 (2001).

[13] J. M. Radcliffe J. Phys. A: Gen. Phys. 4, 313 (1971).

[14] P. Kolenderski and R. Demkowicz-Dobrzanski, Phys. Rev. A 78, 052333 (2008).
[15] H. Makela and K. A. Suominen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 99, 190408 (2007).
[16] P. Bruno, Phys. Rev. Lett. 108, 240402 (2012); J. H. Hannay, J. Phys. A 31, L53 (1998).
[17] Z. Wang and D. Markham, Phys. Rev. Lett. 108, 210407, (2012).
[18] P. Ribeiro and R. Mosseri, Phys. Rev. Lett. 106, 180502 (2011).
[19] W. Dür, G. Vidal, and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. A 62, 062314 (2000).
[20] F. Verstraete, J. Dehaene, B. De Moor, H. Verschelde, Phys. Rev. A, 65: 052112 (2002).
[21] R. M. Gingrich, Phys. Rev. A 65, 052302.
[22] A. Mandilara, V. M. Akulin, A. V. Smilga, and L. Viola, Phys. Rev. A 74, 022331 (2006).
[23] R. Bijurkal, arXiv:quant-ph/0604210.
[24] H. A. Carteret, A. Higuchi, and A. Sudbery, J. Math. Phys. 41, 7932 (2000).
[25] A. Acín, A. Andrianov, L. Costa, E. Jané, J. I.Latorre, and R. Tarrach, Phys. Rev. Lett. 85, 1560 (2000).
[26] V. Coffman, J. Kundu, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A 61, 052306 (2000).